

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the final Office Action dated June 22, 2007. Claims 19-20 and 29-40 are pending in the present application. With this Response, claims 19, 29 and 36 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by any of the amendments or claims proposed in the Response. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in FIGs. 40-41 and pages 42-43 of the specification. Entry of the amendments and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-20 and 29-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Laval et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,173,209, hereafter "Laval"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Specifically, Laval fails to teach or suggest the features of writing electronic ticket information for a plurality of electronic tickets for the event into the information storage chip, "wherein at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets are structured in a format that allows the at least one ticket to be assigned from the information storage chip to at least one other information storage chip using the electronic ticket platform center." as recited in claim 19, and similarly recited in claims 29 and 36. Under the recited configuration, the electronic ticket platform center may delegate assignment of tickets to a user's chip, where the user is provided with the capability to assign tickets to other users, without requiring the users to be contemporaneously present during the initial purchase of the tickets. The claimed assignment mechanism allows the electronic tickets to be safely and reliably distributed or assigned to other information storage chips.

Regarding Laval, the disclosure is directed to the electronic management of admissions to attractions at, for example, an amusement park, which includes the use of an electronic pass or card. As described in Laval, a customer is provided with a choice of standing in line for an attraction or having a spot reserved for admission later without standing in line. (see Laval, col. 3, lines 44-48). The customer uses the electronic pass or card to establish entitlement to access the attraction. Although Laval discloses the use of an electronic pass or card for the purchase of services, the reference also specifically discloses that a user of the card is prevented from acquiring multiple reservations (i.e., passes) for the same attraction (i.e., a particular event). (see Laval, col. 3, lines 51-54). While Laval discloses an embodiment that enables "multiple passes",

the disclosure makes clear that the passes pertain to different times for an event, or an entirely different event altogether - this configuration allows users to select alternate times or events without having to stand in line again (see col. 17, lines 30-42: “[a]s described above, in one or more embodiments of the system and method a customer is prevented from obtaining more than one entitlement or pass for accessing an attraction at a single time . . . [t]he system may be arranged to permit customers to obtain multiple passes at some times and not at others. For example, if the wait time for accessing one or two attractions is particularly long (whether by the first or second queue 24,26) the system may be arranged to permit customers to obtain passes for different attractions so that the customer avoids the need to access one attraction before obtaining a pass for accessing another attraction.”).

As argued previously, the present claims are distinguished by the feature of “a plurality of electronic tickets for the event”, which clearly means that the plurality of tickets are directed to the same event. Laval does not disclose such a feature, and limits ticket issuance to one ticket for each different event (i.e., events having different times or activities - see also col. 8, lines 54-65). Additionally, Laval does not disclose any assignment capabilities for the user’s storage chip once the ticket has issued. Laval additionally teaches away from such a configuration. Laval discloses that the media distributor (38) issues tickets for access based on the first (32) and/or second validator (42) (col. 7, lines 43-53, col. 8, line 66 - col. 9, line 10). Laval further discloses that the validation and ticket admission process is equally applicable to both paper tickets, or other types of tickets, such as bar-coded tickets and “smart” cards (col. 8, lines 11-27). Since the “e-ticket” embodiments serve as proxies for individual paper tickets, Laval appears to have no capability of assignment


Conversely, in the present invention, the user of the information storage chip can purchase one seat (i.e., pass), or a block of seats (i.e., passes) for a specific event. When purchasing a block of seats, a consecutive number of seats can be automatically allocated; and the purchased seats can be easily stored, searched, added, deleted and assigned to another user having a similar information storage chip. (see Applicants’ Application, page 34, lines 20-23 and Figs. 40-41).

Accordingly, claims 19, 29 and 36 are clearly distinguishable over Laval. Likewise, dependent claims 20, 30-35, 37-40 and 61-63 are also clearly distinguishable over Laval based on their respective dependencies on claims 19, 29 and 36.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Director is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818.

Respectfully submitted,

BY



Peter Zura
Reg. No. 46,541
Cust. No. 29175
(312) 807-4208

Dated: October 16, 2007